

MAY 12 1926

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XIX, No. 25

MONDAY, MAY 10, 1926

WHOLE NO. 528

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY Syracuse, New York

SUMMER SESSION

June 28—August 6, 1926

Latin Department

The Latin Department of Syracuse University offers in the Summer Session special courses (1) for teachers of Latin, (2) for graduate students working toward a higher degree, and (3) for others who take a cultural interest in the Classical field.

Latin Composition for Teachers.....	Dr. Place
Latin Methods for the First and Second Years.....	Dr. Place
Cicero's Letters.....	Dr. Place
The Life of the Ancient Romans.....	Dr. Kellogg, Union College
Roman Comedy.....	Dr. Kellogg
Ovid.....	Dr. Dickson
Greek and Roman Sculpture.....	Dr. Dickson
Second-Year Latin.....	Dr. Dickson, Mr. Tracey
Model Class in Beginning Latin	

Mr. Earle T. Tracey, Junior High School, Nashua, N. H.

The courses for graduate students have been arranged for a period of three years, thus making it possible to plan in advance the correlation of courses leading to a higher degree.

Correspondence in regard to courses in the
Latin Department may be addressed to

DR. PERLEY OAKLAND PLACE,
Hall of Languages, Syracuse University,
SYRACUSE, NEW YORK

Harrington's Roman Elegiac Poets

Edited by KARL POMEROY HARRINGTON, Professor of the Latin Language and Literature, Wesleyan University. Cloth, 12mo., 444 pages, with Introduction and Notes. \$1.80. Text edition, \$0.60.

A JUDICIOUS selection from the whole field of Roman elegy, with suitable introductory matter and English comments, is presented in this volume. The selections have been confined strictly to poems written in the elegiac measure, and include the best of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid.

Extensive notes and cross-references assist the student to a comprehensive knowledge of this type of Roman poetry, while the Introduction gives a brief account of its origin and development and the share in this movement borne by each author represented.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO BOSTON ATLANTA



It is Three Books in One Book

MOORE'S ORATIONS OF CICERO

WITH A SELECTION FROM HIS LETTERS

HERE in one convenient and beautifully illustrated volume teachers may find all the reading, grammar, and composition needed for third-year work in Latin. The wider variety of reading recommended by the Classical Investigation is made possible by the inclusion of an unusually large number of selections, among them the chapters from the Fourth Verrine recently recommended for College Entrance.

Catalogue Price \$1.96

BOSTON
CHICAGO

GINN AND COMPANY

ATLANTA

DALLAS

COLUMBUS

NEW YORK
SAN FRANCISCO

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XIX, No. 25

MONDAY, MAY 10, 1926

WHOLE NO. 528

THE BROADWAY TRANSLATIONS THIRTEEN VOLUMES

(Concluded from page 198)

(9) *Gesta Romanorum.* Entertaining Stories Invented by the Monks as a Fire-Side Recreation and Commonly Applied in their Discourses from the Pulpit Whence the Most Celebrated of our own Poets and Others have Extracted Their Plots. Translated by Charles Swan. With a Preface by E. A. Baker. Pp. xx + 472 (\$5.00).

In the volume entitled *Gesta Romanorum* the Preface (vi-xiii) is concerned at first chiefly with the work done by Hermann Oesterley on the *Gesta Romanorum*, as embodied in his definitive edition, published in 1872. There is then (xi-xii) a brief discussion of Swan's translation of the *Gesta* (first published in 1824), and (xii) of the version of the *Gesta* edited for the Roxburgh Club, in 1838, by Sir Frederic Madden, reedited for The Early English Text Society, in 1879, by Mr. S. J. H. Herrtage.

The Preface that, in 1877, Mr. Wynnard Hooper wrote to an edition of Swan's translation which was published then as part of the Bohn Library is included in the volume under review (1-71).

Swan's translation is given without change. I judge that the Notes (375-472) are the notes appended by Swan to his translation.

For the value of the tales brought together in this volume see the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*¹¹, 11.910, under *Gesta Romanorum*.

In The *New York Nation* 108.424-425 (March 22, 1919), Mr. Homer E. Woodbridge published a short article entitled *Mark Twain and the "Gesta Romanorum"*. In this he wrote in the most eulogistic terms of Twain's "remarkable satiric romance, 'The Mysterious Stranger'". On the basis of a letter from Twain to William Howell, dated May 12, 1899, but published only a short time before Mr. Woodbridge wrote his article, the latter declares that "... Mark Twain intended to put more of himself into the book <The Mysterious Stranger> than he had put into any other, and that he thought he was succeeding". Mr. Woodbridge then tells us that, not long before, he had come upon a story in the *Gesta Romanorum* "which offers striking parallels to the machinery and some of the incidents of 'The Mysterious Stranger'". This story is the tale entitled *De Eremita et Pastore et Angelo*. The story is No. LXXX in Swan's version, and is there entitled *Of the Cunning of the Devil, and Of the Secret Judgments of God* (pages 194-196 in the volume under review). Of the relation between the Tale in the *Gesta* and Mark Twain's story Mr. Woodbridge writes in very entertaining and suggestive fashion.

(10) *Martial.* The Twelve Books of Epigrams⁴. Translated by J. A. Pott and F. A. Wright. Pp. xiv + 402 (\$5.00).

The Introduction to the volume on Martial, by Mr. Wright, deals with the Life of Martial (v-viii), The Epigrams (viii-xi), and Martial as Poet (xii-xiv). In the pages on The Epigrams occurs an interesting account of Martial's picture of Domitian. I quote it in part (ix):

<In the portrait of Domitian which Martial gives us>

We see, not at all a cruel and detestable tyrant, 'calvus Nero', but rather a patriotic, popular, and—strangely enough—a rather Puritanical prince, whose benevolent activities at Rome run on much the same lines as those followed to-day by the London County Council. He curbs the enterprise of the pushing tradesmen who encroach upon the highway with their stalls; he settles scales of fees, and regulates theatre accommodation; he offers handsome prizes at the literary and musical competitions which take place in his Alban villa; he employs a young and deserving architect to build for him a palace which shall be worthy of the world's capital city; he keeps a strict watch over the morals of the community, passes laws to protect young children from vicious degradation, endeavours to preserve the sanctity of marriage and family life, and discourages all licentiousness in literature, being himself so strict in his regard for propriety that our poet has to be far more careful than is his wont when he is writing for the imperial ear. These are some of the impressions of Domitian's character that we get from a perusal of the Epigrams, and although Martial is commonly accused of shameless flattery and sycophantic adulation, it is well, for the sake of truth, that we have in him some corrective to the venom of Tacitus' pen. Domitian had his faults, but for the historian his unforgivable sin was that, being himself something of a realist, he refused to acquiesce any longer in the legal fiction that made the senate ostensibly a co-partner in empire.

Here we have more "Whitewashing of the Ancients" (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 19.143-148). Mr. Wright evidently is not of one mind with Professor Marsh (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 19.135-138), about Tacitus, and he would disagree sharply, I take it, with Professor C. H. Moore concerning Tacitus's estimate of Domitian (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 19.184-185).

Mr. Wright speaks sympathetically, too, of Martial's great merits as a poet. See especially pages xiii-xiv.

There is room for but a few specimens of the renderings. First I give some by Mr. Pott.

1.19. The Last Straw:

Four teeth, I think, were left to you
Until, my ancient dame,
A fit of coughing shot out two,
A second did the same.

¹The authors disregard Book 13 (127 Xenia, mostly of two verses each), and Book 14 (227 Apophoreta, of two verses each).

And now the third to come shall find
There's nothing in the way,
So, Aelia, calm your anxious mind,
And cough the livelong day.

1.25, To Faustinus:

Publish your works—too long you have forbore—
Let not your polished work in darkness lie;
'Tis such as Cecrops' city should not scorn,
Nor Rome's ripe scholar pass in silence by.
Nay, doth it irk you that reward is nigh?
Why bar out fame who standeth at the gate?
Give birth to what must live, before you die,
For honour paid to ashes comes too late.

1.27, 'Tis Wise to Forget':

I may have asked you here to dine,
But that was late at night,
And none of us had spared the wine
If I remember right.
You thought the invitation meant,
Though wine obscured my wit!
And—O most parlous precedent—
You made a note of it!
The maxim that in Greece was true
Is true in Rome to-day—
'I hate a fellow-topper who
Remembers what I say'.

1.41, The Wit:

Caecilius, you think your taste is pretty;
Believe me, any kennel in the city
Could furnish rascals just as wise and witty.
Yours is the kind that every gutter hatches,
Across the Tiber it is bred in batches
And trades in broken glass and peddles matches.
If you would find your peers, the street supplies
them,
The sellers of boiled peas, the lout that buys them,
The cheating quacks with snakes to advertise them.
The salt meat vendor's hireling is your fellow,
To yours the street musician's tones are mellow,
The reeking sausage-seller thus does bellow.
Slave-dealing Spaniards, refuse of the nation,
The debauchee whose driveling iteration
Is proof of babbling age and dissipation⁵,
These are your equals. It does not beseem you
To count yourself what no one else will deem you,
No Tettius Caballus we esteem you.
Let not the meaning of his name misguide you.
The taste and wit that nature has denied you
No dullard's horse-play can provide you.

I call this a very poor rendering. It overplays decidedly the raciness of the original (see, above, page 198, the quotation from Professor Allinson), and completely vulgarizes a piece that in its Latin expression is not vulgar. The fourth stanza is somewhat obscure. The last stanza has a serious blemish, in the use of *you* in two different senses. The introduction of *you*, in the first line of this stanza, to denote the general public, is very bad, since everywhere else in the version *you* and *your* refer to Caecilius.

The following are by Mr. Wright:

1.55, Country Pleasures:

Dear Fronto, famed alike in peace and war,
If you would learn what my chief wishes are,
Know that I crave some acres few to till,

And live at ease as careless as I will.
Why should I always trudge the stony street,
And go each morn some haughty lord to meet,
When all the country's spoils are mine to get,
Caught in the meshes of a hunting-net?
When I with line could snare the leaping trout
And from the hive press golden honey out,
While Joan my humble board with eggs supplies,
Boiled on a fire whose logs she never buys?
May he not love this life who loves not me,
And still in Rome a pale-faced client be!

1.86, Near Neighbours:

You think that I'm a happy man
With Novius so near me,
And when I lift my finger can
Get him to cheer me.
The truth is he's as far away
As is my other friend
Who rules Syene's land to-day
Where Nile's blue waters end.
I never meet him at a meal,
Nor find his door ajar,
There's not a soul in Rome, I feel,
So near and yet so far.
Well, either I or he must move
Away from here, that's plain.
When we're not neighbours, it may prove
That we shall meet again.

(11) The Idylls, Epigrams, and Other Poems of Theocritus With the Fragments of Bion and Moschus. By J. H. Hallard. Fourth Edition, Revised Throughout and Reset. Pp. xvi + 220 (\$3.00).

Mr. Hallard's volume contains

Preface (ix–xvi); Introduction, Greek Bucolic Poetry (1–13); Theocritus (15–192); Bion (193–206); Moschus (207–217); Index of First Lines (219–220).

In his Preface (ix) Mr. Hallard explains that, in his opinion,

... the best method for an intending translator of Theocritus were to vary his measures a good deal. The principle on which I have gone is briefly this: to use blank verse for dialogue and description, rimed anapaestic metres for lyric passages, and unrimed dactylic hexameters for narrative....

The interesting discussion of the meters employed by Mr. Hallard, and his methods of work thereon is continued to page xiii. On pages xiii–xiv he discusses the feeling which, he says, many will have, 'that the proper vehicle for translating Theocritus would be Scots'. This he refuses to believe. In this discussion Mr. Hallard makes some very sound remarks, which ought to become familiar to certain folk who contrast the Eclogues of Vergil with the Idylls of Theocritus, to Vergil's disadvantage, on the ground that Theocritus is 'natural', Vergil wholly 'artificial'. Hear Mr. Hallard (xiv–xv):

... it cannot be too often insisted that Theocritus, in spite of all his seeming *naïveté*, was not (as Burns, for example, was) an inspired yeoman, writing mainly for his own class. He was a subtle-minded, self-conscious and delicate artist, living at refined and voluptuous courts in a 'decadent' age of literature, and writing for the pleasure of kings. His style is the flower of a literary hot-house. It is composite, many-coloured, and not without reminiscent archaism. How then could the language of such a poet be transmuted into the language of a people among whose literary qualities 'literary quality' can hardly be reckoned prominent? No doubt Theocritus had profoundly felt the charm of Sicilian peasant life, just as, it might perhaps be

⁵The book has a period here. The stanza is thus without syntax or sense.

argued, Allan Ramsay had felt the charm of the peasant life he knew. But what a difference there is in the two *milieux!* How unlike Daphnis is to Patie! How different are the wooded slopes of Etna from the bleak Pentland Hills! What a leap in the imagination from Arethusa to the springs of Habbie's Howe! . . .

These sentences supply a needed corrective even to the work of so fine a scholar as the late Sir Richard Jebb (I am thinking of his treatment of Theocritus in his excellent book, *The Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry*, 232-233 [Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1894]). In far greater need of correction is what Mr. Walter W. Greg says, in his book, *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama*, 8-16 (London, A. H. Bullen, 1916). Mr. Greg charges Vergil with having "made the bucolic eclogue what, with trifling variation, it was to remain for eighteen centuries, a form based upon artificiality and convention". Mr. Greg might have remembered that every form of literature, even the Homeric poems, is to some extent based on artificiality and convention. He might have remembered, too, that Theocritus, not Vergil, began the use of allegory in pastoral poetry, and that Theocritus had also brought into his pastoral poetry personages of the city-world, not of the shepherd world at all.

I give Mr. Hallard's rendering (63-64) of the closing verses of Eclogue 7, *The Thalysia, or Harvest Feast of Demeter*, which Sainte-Beuve called 'Queen of Eclogues'.

These were my words, and he, as aforetime, smiling sweetly,
Gave me the goatherd's crook as a parting gift of the
Muses;
Then to the leftward bent his way and made unto
Pyxa.
We to the home of our host Phrasidemus turned and
betook us,
Eucritus, I, and the comely Amyntas, and there we
rejoicing
Laid us deep on a couch of fragrant rushes and vine-leaves.
Poplars and whispering elms waved o'er it; a sacred
fountain
Babbling and purling gushed from the Naiads' grotto
anear us;
Sunburnt merry cicadas aloft on the shadowy
branches
Shrilled their unending song, and afar in the bushes
of bramble
Softly the tree-frog chirped, and the crested larks and
the finches
Caroled, a turtle crooned, and around those mur-
muring waters
Darted golden bees; there all things richly of Summer
Smelt, and of Autumn; pears and apples in luscious
abundance
Rolled at our feet and sides, and down on the meadow
about us
Sloe-trees drooped their sprays thick-laden with
purple fruitage.
Then from the wine-jar's neck was a four-years-old
seal loosened.
Say, Castalian nymphs that haunt Parnassus, was
ever
Cup like this in the rocky repair of the centaur
Pholus
Held by Chiron the old unto Heracles? Yea, and the
shepherd,

He that grazed the flock by the river Anapus, and
peleted
Vessels with bergs, that monster immense, what
nectar did he quaff,
(Then when his legs were beguiled into dancing
about his cavern),
Like to the draught, O Nymphs, ye slaked that day
from the fountain,
Close by the altar-stone of Demeter, goddess of
garners?
There in her heaped-up grain may I in another
season
Plant my ample fan, while she stands smiling near it,
Holding in either hand little sheaves of corn and
of poppy!

Did space permit, I would set down here the rendering of these verses by Mr. A. S. Way, in his book, *Theocritus, Bion, Moschus, Translated into English Verse* (Cambridge University Press, 1913).

(12) *Heliodorus, An Aethiopian Romance*. Translated by Thomas Underdowne (Anno 1587). Revised and Partly Rewritten by F. A. Wright. Pp. 323 (\$3.00).

The volume entitled *Heliodorus, An Aethiopian Romance* contains an Introduction (1-5), and the translation of the ten books of the Romance (7-323). The Introduction deals with Heliodorus and his Romance (1-3) and with Mr. Wright's revision of Underdowne's translation (4-5). Wherever it was possible, says Mr. Wright, he has used Underdowne's own words, with the spelling, of course, modernized. He has at times changed Underdowne's syntax, and has cut down "the excessive length of his periods", which run, at times, to twenty-five lines and two hundred and fifty words. In many passages, continues Mr. Wright, Underdowne made mistakes, especially because he translated usually, "not from the Greek, but from the Latin version of Warschewiczki published in 1551". Underdowne had "docilely" followed the Polish translator, even in his errors; often, too, he introduced errors of his own, as the result of his "very imperfect acquaintance even with Latin".

. . . it will be seen that the reviser's task was no sinecure. But although Underdowne has little Latin and less Greek he is a superb master of English. I feel almost ashamed to point out his errors and can only hope that my poor attempts at correction will not have too ludicrous an effect, as patches of cheap white cotton upon an ancient robe of purple silk.

Mr. Wright's version runs very smoothly.

(13) *Suetonius, History of Twelve Caesars*. Translated by Philemon Holland (Anno 1606). Edited by J. H. Freese. Pp. xvi + 392 + 120 (\$5.00).

The Broadway Translations version of Suetonius, *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, contains a Prefatory Note, by Mr. Freese (v-vi); Genealogical Table of the Julio-Claudian House (viii-ix); Introduction, by Philemon Holland (x-xvi); A Supplement to the Beginning of Gaius Julius Caesar, Dictator (1-4); Translation of the Lives of the Twelve Caesars, by Holland, revised by Mr. Freese (4-392); Notes, mainly by Holland, in part by Mr. Freese (1-112); Index to Suetonius (115-120).

Mr. Freese tells us, in his Prefatory Note, that his edition of Holland's translation of Suetonius is "not intended for the professed scholar"; he has tried

rather to make Holland's version "simpler for the non-classical reader, at the same time preserving as far as possible the vigour and quaintness which constitute its great charm".

I give one specimen of Holland's translation as revised by Mr. Freese in accordance with these principles—the version of Augustus 1:

That the principal name and lineage of the Octavii dwelt in times past at Velitrae, there be many evidences to show; for both a street in the most frequented place of the said town long since carried the name Octavius, and also there was to be seen an altar there consecrated by one Octavius, who, being general of the field in a war against the borderers, when he happened to be sacrificing to Mars, upon news brought that the enemy gave a sudden charge, caught the inwards of the beast sacrificed, half-raw as they were, out of the fire, cut and offered them accordingly, and so entered into battle and returned with victory. There is, besides, a public act extant upon record, wherein decreed and provided it was that, every year after, the inwards in like manner should be presented unto Mars, and the rest of the sacrifice remaining carried back unto the Octavii.

Professor John C. Rolfe's version of this passage (Loeb Classical Library, 1914) runs as follows:

There are many indications that the Octavian family was in days of old a distinguished one at Velitrae; for not only was a street in the most frequented part of the town long ago called Octavian, but an altar was shown there besides, consecrated by an Octavius. This man was leader in a war with a neighbouring town, and when news of a sudden onset of the enemy was brought to him just as he chanced to be sacrificing to Mars, he snatched the inwards of the victim from the fire and offered them up half raw; and thus he went forth to battle, and returned victorious. There was besides, a decree of the people on record, providing that for the future too the inwards should be offered to Mars in the same way, and the rest of the victims be handed over to the Octavii.

CHARLES KNAPP

AN EXPERIMENT IN TEACHING LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION IN SMALL CLASSES¹

Perhaps it will not be amiss to begin by remarking that I speak only of Secondary Schools and the conditions which grow out of them. Far more than in College, pupils in such Schools study from compulsion rather than from any desire to learn, and, therefore, unless the subject is very definitely interesting will, for the most part, work only so far as they *must*, in order to achieve certain grades whereby they may attain rewards or avoid punishments.

This is very noticeable in the earlier stages of the study of the languages. In Latin, the literature part of the Secondary School course (especially Cicero or Virgil) has an interest of its own. Besides, it is not, for most pupils, so difficult as to discourage them from doing the work as a matter of course and gaining some pleasure therefrom.

In 'prose composition' it is a different story. A certain 'language sense', or in any case a fairly secure foundation of the elementary grammar and vocabulary is a minimum essential before the writing of

prose will prove attractive to the average child. As I teach in a Boarding School, my classes each year consist from $1/3$ to $1/2$ of new girls who have come in from other Schools. Their training is most varied, seldom resembling what my own girls, left over from the previous year, have had. The interest inherent in prose composition is not such as to make any pupil who finds it difficult and who is not naturally studious likely to turn much energy to it without artificial stimulus.

Let me give a couple of instances to illustrate the situation which I found needed amending. An intelligent girl was once transferred to my Caesar class from another School at the beginning of the second semester. In translation she easily kept abreast of the class, but her prose was so appalling in its entire lack of knowledge of forms or syntax that I asked her, in bewilderment, by exactly what method her prose composition had been taught that she had been able to pass one semester of Caesar in which prose writing was taken into account. She explained explicitly. She said:

Every day we had three sentences assigned for homework. In class the teacher went over these, and we corrected and kept our papers, but were not graded on them. On Friday we had a little test of four sentences—two from those we had had during the week, and two new ones something like them, and our prose mark was our grade in that weekly test. I always memorized all the sentences on my corrected papers, and so was sure of getting *two* right.

So much for her training in prose! Of course it is obvious that, with two sentences out of four memorized, she was sure of a grade of at least 50% on prose—most likely 60 or more (in part by accident!), which would easily average in with her other work to keep her above the passing mark. In my class she was fortunate at first if she ever earned a grade of 20% or so, and at that late date, when we were already working up to the College Entrance Board examinations, only continuous coaching saved her from failing in the semester's work too badly even to take a re-examination. Yet she had come to us with an apparently good record in first semester Caesar.

Many girls who come to me from elsewhere tell me that they have been taught prose in variations of the following method. Sentences are assigned to be done at home; the same sentences are placed on the board by the pupils next day in the class-room, either from memory or copied from papers. These are explained by the teacher and corrected, and the papers are then handed in; then, perhaps, a few similar sentences are done at sight, perhaps not. The program varies; but, at all events, in most cases that I have been able to assure myself of, the burden of the grade or mark in prose rests on the work the pupil has done at home, with full access to Grammar and to Vocabulary at every perplexity, to say nothing of the possibilities of pupils working together, or obtaining outside help, or even copying the work of others.

Well, exactly so did I myself begin teaching prose, except that, from the outset, I counted the home work as only one half, or less, of the whole, and rated the

¹This paper was read at the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Swarthmore College, May 1-2, 1925.

sight work done in the class-room as the other half, or even more. This plan worked well enough, for a while, until one of my new pupils, who by laborious and painstaking effort could always make a grade of 90 on her home work, by looking up everything and verifying, but not *learning*, her syntax, could make only from 30 to 50 on class-room work at sight. She had come into my Cicero class, where the excellent home work kept her head above water; but it was only too obvious that, if she passed into the Vergil class, the next year would spell disaster for her in the advanced prose composition.

From that moment my tactics changed, and the results have decidedly justified the means.

There seemed to be three main conditions to amend.

First, the work in prose must in itself be made to seem *important*, however difficult or uninteresting it might appear to the pupil with no knack at languages, or with an insecure foundation in Latin, or with both handicaps, and not merely something to be done well enough so that the translation would pull up the average for the whole course.

Secondly, the home work must be made a matter of both understanding and learning the principles and the vocabulary assigned for the day, that is of learning and understanding them so thoroughly that the student would have them on tap for instant use in class, instead of being obliged to devote the study period largely to looking up matter not previously learned, with a resulting lack of time to master properly the new work, or lack of interest in so doing.

Thirdly, the class-room work must not be a mere recitation and correction of what was studied at home, but must itself contribute largely towards increased power to recognize, and handle properly, the problems in syntax offered by the English sentences, and towards accuracy and speed in interpreting them in Latin.

These conditions have been met as follows.

(1) Prose and translation are graded separately, as though they were two distinct subjects. Since Latin is a 5-point subject, I rate the translation as 3 points and the prose as 2. This may seem an underrating of translation, but *one* point on prose is much too little, for several reasons, and for intraschool purposes (in our School, at all events), the 2 to 3 ratio works out best. This treatment of prose as a separate subject gives it a standing of its own in the pupils' eyes, since poor prose can no longer be offset by good translation. According to the system where I teach, a girl is kept out of dramatics and off athletic teams if she has less than 70% in any subject; she is put into Study Hall if she has less than 80 in any one subject, though all else may be in the 90's, and in the same way may be kept off the honor roll.

Thus the pupil recognizes that a good standing in prose is quite as important for her interests as a good standing in any other subject, and she works on her prose accordingly, to an extent that many pupils never do under the system of averaging all the Latin work into one mark.

(2) The second condition, mastery of the subject in the home work, is met by making the entire prose grade rest on *sight prose* done in the class-room. This seems reasonable. In *translation* the whole grade is on what can be recited. No one would think of giving credit on a translation written out with constant reference to vocabulary and notes, and read aloud in class. Why, then, should we attach any value to *prose* that has been similarly prepared? Most pupils can, as we know, look up the same words and constructions over and over, instead of learning them once for all, and yet achieve a fair mark by their home work, if they put sufficient effort on it. My aim is to get completely away from this possibility.

If they understand that, when sentences in the book are assigned, their aim should be not merely to do those particular sentences correctly and then put the paper away as finished, or possibly memorize this written work for reproduction in the class-room, but to grasp the principles and the vocabulary in the sentences studied so firmly that in the class-room they will be able to handle any similar syntax or vocabulary in any altered combination of mood, tense, person, number, case, etc., they soon find that a real understanding is necessary. They will get, with astonishing speed, the habit of attentive instead of careless study, and will be able to handle far more difficult work in very much less time than I can imagine being brought about by the note-book-or-paper-written-at-home method, followed in the class-room by further drill on the same sentences or material.

(3) The third condition—making the class-room work itself result in definite progress—grows out of the second. The major part of our prose period, after preliminary explanations, is devoted to sight prose written at the seats, while I move from pupil to pupil and continuously correct, point out, and explain. The sentences have all been made up by myself for the occasion, and are placed on the blackboard, either beforehand, behind a curtain or map that can be kept down until the class is ready to begin, or else are written on the board quickly after the class begins. Alternate rows of pupils from the front to the back of the room are numbered 1 and 2; the 1's do the odd-numbered sentences first, the 2's the even-numbered first. This means that no child is doing the same sentences as the pupil on either side of her; there is no chance for accidental or intentional looking at a nearby paper, and the sentence I am explaining in a low voice at any given moment has nothing to do with the work that the pupils close enough to hear, are doing, so that the explanation neither distracts them nor assists any except the girl with whom I am working. The sentences are so planned as to repeat at least twice, once in the odd-numbered and once in the even-numbered sentences, some variation of any idiom, matter of vocabulary, or point of syntax I wish to emphasize, so that every pupil has the chance, if she has her wits about her, to recognize it the second time and not make a similar mistake twice, after having been once corrected some fifteen minutes or so earlier.

This should of course usually result in the second half of the paper having fewer mistakes, and this proves to be generally the case.

So much for the main procedure. Of course the plan must be applied very differently according to the ages of students.

In the elementary class, there is, of course, no separate rating of prose composition, but all the work done is averaged into one final mark. Also, there is written home work handed in, but it counts only lightly in comparison to the fifteen minutes or so of written work, done at sight in the class-room.

In Caesar, too, I have hitherto averaged all the work together, in the final mark; but I expect to begin rating the prose separately in the second semester, hereafter. In the first two months of the Caesar course, we have a few prose sentences every day towards the end of the period, and, after that, a period of prose once, or sometimes twice, a week. For this year, too, papers must be prepared at home, written in *ink*, and these are corrected in pencil by the pupils at the beginning of the period. I suggest one correct version of each sentence and discuss suggestions made by pupils for further correct ways of expressing the same idea, or show emphatically why other ways proposed can *not* be employed.

These papers are turned in to me, but I do not hand them back nor count them in any way whatever, except to deduct ten or fifteen points if they are *not* done, since they are required for the practice. The entire grade in prose depends on class-room work done at sight, which consists of permutations of the constructions and the vocabulary of the sentences just done as new work, combined with much review in constructions and on 'catchy' points that have previously made trouble in that class.

One word here as to the marking-system. I believe, of course, in theory, with most teachers, that pupils should do their best without reference to marks, but we all know that with children in their teens (as well as with many older students) the actual mark is a great incentive, especially when there is a reward for high grades, or a penalty for low grades.

As I go round and round the class, I place a check at the top of every pupil's paper for each sentence corrected, with a stroke across the check for every mistake in the sentence—or sometimes a half-stroke for what I call minor mistakes, such as an error in gender when all else is correct, or an unimportant slip in spelling. Thus, even without knowing just how much each mistake will count, every pupil has before her a record of progress as she goes along, pays very eager attention to all corrections in order to avoid repeating the mistakes further on, and usually becomes much more careful immediately if, for instance, a sentence-check is full of cross-strokes, marking errors due to thoughtless inaccuracy. At the end of the period I can estimate each grade roughly (within five points or so) for the pupil's satisfaction, and put it into my book more accurately at my leisure. These papers are not handed back unless some eager pupil asks for hers to keep.

It is obvious why this paper is entitled An Experiment for Small Classes. One cannot keep up with very many pupils during the teaching period. Fifteen is the maximum I can keep up with at all, while giving any worth-while amount of individual attention and personal explanation as I go around; even under such circumstances some few papers are not more than two-thirds corrected at the end of the period. Twelve is a much more profitable number, and with ten pupils or less all work is kept corrected up to the last sentence the slowest pupil is working on when the bell rings.

In the Cicero course, no home written work is handed in in prose, except for very unusual reasons; but sentences are assigned to study. We have 45-minute periods. The class can discuss the next day's assignment and the sentences assigned for the present recitation, together with any questions that come up, inside of fifteen minutes. After that, 80% of the class can finish some ten sentences at sight, all much harder (as involving complicated review) than those assigned in prose books for study. I make up all sentences except where I use the College Entrance Board examinations. It takes nearly a period to make up and put sentences on the blackboard, but this is little more than I used to spend correcting futile prepared papers, and it admits perpetual drill on weak or common points.

In the Vergil course, for a few weeks we work much as in the Cicero class. We then begin with College Entrance Board examinations at sight, in addition to my made-up sentences. From this time on, I have the class for two consecutive periods on the prose day, and it has been possible to secure this in three different Schools in New Jersey and Ohio. If one or two girls have a conflict, they come to me at another time for the extra period. A one-hour Board examination can easily be done by the average pupil in the second forty-five minutes. This leaves the first period for discussion, etc., and for enough of my drill sentences to illustrate all new work and review. The published books which give the collected Latin and Greek examinations in five-year periods supply fifteen fourth-year examinations, and so furnish varied practice on connected prose, besides familiarizing pupils with the 'look' of the examinations. Every girl in my Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil classes owns one of these books, but I myself keep their copies in the class-room so that they shall be always available. I also buy the actual Board examinations by the dozen, from year to year, and use these in the class-room when the book is exhausted.

One or two by-products are to be noted. For one thing, the plan of having the class-room work count for the entire mark, not only, as I have shown, demands pretty thorough understanding before the writing is begun, but requires speed in order to cover the ground in the time allotted.

A premium is put on speed *plus* accuracy by (a) excusing, early, any who finish the work with a grade above 80; (b) requiring any who finish early but have less than 80 to stay and do over, on the *reverse* side of the paper, the sentences that were done most poorly; (c) marking down definitely for unusual slowness (on

the ground that it results in insufficient practice) in addition to counting off relatively more for each mistake.

Again, it is possible in the class-room period to develop new vocabulary over and above that assigned for home study. I always have ready on the blackboard a few additional new words or idioms. We take a good look at them, and discuss them for a moment. They are, however, erased before the pupils begin to write, but, being incorporated at least twice in the blackboard sentences, they have usually been well grasped before the period is over.

Of course in the drill sentences we keep up a constant use of such 'catchy' but common words as *redeo* and *reddo*, *servio* and *servo*, *civis* and *civitas*, and make liberal use of adjectives in all degrees of comparison, thus keeping up a continual automatic check on the pupils' knowledge of case and gender, without increasing the difficulty of the main construction.

One class of mine, almost as a whole, made persistent mistakes on the conjugation of *eo*. Another wrote *equitates* for *equites*; no amount of pointing out the distinction and contrasting the words made any permanent impression.

In each instance I simply announced that they *must* be learned and attended to; that henceforth any mistake on *any* form of *eo* or of *equites* or of *equitatus* in the respective classes would be a five-point mistake instead of a two-point or a three-point mistake. The difficulty disappeared with a speed which showed up the carelessness that had produced the previous repeated errors. Within two weeks the one class handled *eo* with almost infallible accuracy, and the fourteen girls in the other practically ceased to confuse the words for 'cavalry'.

I must anticipate and answer one or two obvious objections to the foregoing scheme.

One objection may be the disadvantage of not having notebooks to review at the end of the month or the term. In my own experience, this is more than offset by the fact that the prose has been understood, all along, much better than it ever was when the sentences were written and corrected in notebooks. Somehow the girls seem able to review, from references in prose book and Grammar, just as effectively, if not more so.

Secondly, of course the teaching period is decidedly more strenuous physically than it used to be. Here I can only say, 'It is worth the extra effort'.

A third objection may be the lack of intensive or exclusive drill on new constructions when they are first taught. My personal observation is that incessant drill, as such, does not lead to anything. We all have the experience that pupils who can do quite difficult and complicated constructions when drilled on them exclusively, or so often that they may expect them in practically every sentence, fail to recognize them when they are interspersed with others on connected prose passages or in review. The difficulty is much lessened when the new constructions are, from the very first day of practising them, combined with familiar ones from which they must be distinguished.

To summarize, then, my 'experiment', in so far as it differs from the teaching of prose prevalent in many Schools, consists, first, in grading the prose as a separate subject, thus greatly enhancing its standing in the pupils' eyes; secondly, in the fact that the ability to master principles and to handle them at sight is made all-important by grading only the work done at sight in the class-room; thirdly, the class period itself contributes greatly to advancing a pupil's mastery of the subject, because there are continual oversight and explanation of the individual mistakes, and because drill is afforded by sentences carefully devised to meet the weak points of each particular group of pupils.

CENTENARY COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, DOROTHY WHITMAN
HACKETTSTOWN, NEW JERSEY

REVIEWS

Greek Historical Thought from Homer to the Age of Heraclius. Introduction and Translation. By Arnold J. Toynbee. London: J. M. Dent and Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company (1924). Pp. xxxiv + 256.

Mr. Arnold J. Toynbee, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, in 1912-1915, was a member of the Political Intelligence Department of the British Foreign Office in 1915, and, later, of the Middle Eastern Section of the British Delegation to the Peace Conference at Paris. From 1919 to 1924 he held the Koraes Professorship of Byzantine and Modern Greek Language, Literature, and History at the University of London. He is the author of some eight books and various articles dealing chiefly with Modern Greece, the Balkan States, and the Ottoman Empire. His personal knowledge of the Nearer East and of modern international affairs gives him an unusual and advantageous background for selecting from ancient literature passages of historical significance.

The present volume and its complement, Greek Civilization and Character: The Self-Revelation of Ancient Greek Society (1924), belong to a series¹ called The Library of Greek Thought, edited by Dr. Ernest Barker, the ultimate object of which is "to enable English readers to take a comparative view of Hellenic and Modern Western thought in various fields . . ." (Greek Civilization, vi). The volume entitled Greek Historical Thought contains in fresh and vigorous translations into modern English, mostly by Mr. Toynbee himself, passages from various ancient Greek authors expressing their views on human life and history, or on the methods and principles of historical composition. The book proper begins with the "Prefaces" to the works of seventeen Greek historians (1-100), including, of course, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Polybius, but also less known persons such as Herodian and Agathias, and ending with Theophylactus Simocatta the Egyptian, who wrote in the earlier half of the seventh century after Christ. Part II, The Philosophy

¹Another volume of the series, entitled Greek Economics, by M. L. W. Laistner, was reviewed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17. 144, by Professor W. L. Westermann. Professor Toynbee's other volume, Greek Civilization and Character, will be reviewed in the current volume of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. C. K. >

of History (103-198), contains selections on certain topics, such as Mutability (103-128), Pride, Doom and the Envy of the Gods (129-140), Law and Causation (160-172), etc. Part III, The Art of History (201-240), has two sections, on Technique (201-219) and Criticism (220-240). Part IV (243-248) consists of the "Epilogues" of Xenophon and Polybius. The range is very wide, the choice of selections admirable, the translations lively and as accurate as translations can well be. The book is pleasant and entertaining reading for laymen or for scholars. Many of the former will be surprised at the interest of the selections themselves; many of the latter will enjoy meeting here some familiar friends and will profit by making the acquaintance of some others whom heretofore they have shamefully ignored.

The only original part of the book is its Introduction, which is short (v-xxviii), and has no very intimate connection with the book itself. Its author makes certain general observations as an "aid to interpretation", e. g. that (viii) "... the Hellenic historians (especially the greatest of them) were by no means purely Hellenic in race", that Hellenic historical thought was (x) "... by no means exclusively the creation of professional historians", that most of the ancient Greek historians (xi) "were men of the world", "rising men of action with broken careers..." Mr. Toynbee discusses the limits of the period from which his selections were taken, the principles and the methods of translation (xiii-xxi), his choice of certain words such as "Hellenic" and "Greek" to translate the corresponding terms in the original (xxiii-xxv). But he draws no conclusions from his compilation as to the soundness or the defects of Greek historical thought, or the methods and the standards of historical research and criticism among the ancient Greeks. The reader gets the impression that there is little real coherence between the passages selected, and that the basis of the selection was really the interest of the passages themselves.

It is impossible to treat the Introduction to this volume independently of the Introduction to the other (*Greek Civilization and Character*). I find myself beset by a difficulty in understanding definitely some of the terms employed. Doubtless my own obtuseness is at fault; but even in my humbler moments, I am not wholly free from a suspicion that the author himself may not be entirely clear in his own mind as to the precise meaning of phrases such as "historical experience" and "historical thought". He says (*Greek Civilization*, viii-ix):

Thus the history and the historical thought of any society are more intimately related to one another than the scientific thought of a society is related to the permanent phenomena of the physical environment....

Again we read (ix-x),

... a volume in this series dealing with Hellenic scientific thought would not necessarily gain anything from a companion volume setting forth objectively (if that were possible) the relevant facts regarding the permanent environment of the human race, whereas a supplement of this kind is almost indispensable to the reader when the object of the thought is not physical

nature but human history. The present volume is an attempt to supply this need by presenting to English readers the object of Hellenic historical thought as seen through the eyes of Hellenic historians....

It seems to me that there is a confusion here between the actual events and situations which constitute the experience of a people, and the mosaic of statements by the people themselves about the facts of their national experience which until recently has passed for history. The only important difference for us between the investigation of the phenomena of the physical environment and the investigation of the phenomena of the historical experience of any ancient society is that commonly the former still exist and can be studied by us directly, while the latter belong to the past and can now be studied only indirectly through the reflections of them in the literature, records, documents, and monuments of that society. What a certain society thought about its physical environment or about its historical experience is not of much importance to us: to understand either we need to see the facts through our own eyes, not through theirs.

Inevitably collections of passages selected out of the ancient literature from some particular point of view recall the somewhat similar collections and compendia of the Byzantine Age. We have a good many such nowadays, in 'Source-Books' and the like. Undoubtedly the Byzantine collections disclose a certain degeneracy in that period, and certainly they caused the destruction of large parts of the ancient literature by providing a cheap substitute. In our time the printing-press has made what still remains of that literature secure from further loss. Whether the modern compendia contribute to degeneracy among us depends on the purpose for which they are used.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM K. PRENTICE

Warfare By Land and Sea. By Eugene S. McCartney. Boston: Marshall Jones Company (1923). Pp. xix + 206. \$1.50.

Dr. McCartney's book, *Warfare By Land and Sea*, a volume in the series entitled *Our Debt to Greece and Rome*, is a good book, worth doing and done well. A subject of fascinating and perennial interest—for war is incomparably the most magnificent and spectacular of all group activities and bulks uncommonly large in almost every vista of the ancient past, whatever one may think of its desirability as a social institution—has been treated in these pages with a happy combination of knowledge without pedantry, and freshness without persiflage or triviality. The book should be in the hands of every teacher of the Classics, and in every School library, for it is well calculated to stimulate the interest of many a student of Caesar and Xenophon, of Vergil and Homer.

The contents of the book are as follows:

- I. Permanency of Ancient Contributions (3-13);
- II. The Evolution of Generalship (14-24); III. The Phalanx and the Legion (25-32); IV. Army Organization: The Growth of its Branches (33-38); V. Shock and Fire: The Development of Artillery (39-54); VI. Greek Contributions to Tactics and Strategy

(55-80); VII. Greek Cavalry (81-86); VIII. The Martial Spirit of Rome (87-92); IX. Roman Drill and Discipline (93-101); X. The Spade in the Roman Army (102-110); XI. Roman Contributions to Tactics and Strategy (111-140); XII. Roman Cavalry (141-149); XIII. Ancient and Modern Analogies (150-162); XIV. Naval Indebtedness (163-185); XV. Conclusion (186-189); Notes (193-203); Bibliography (204-206).

All the principal aspects of warfare in theory and in practice are touched upon, and at every point the indebtedness of the modern world to the ancient is duly recorded, generally, and very wisely, in the *ipsissima verba* of the great modern masters of the art. Especially good, as putting the whole story in a nutshell, is the quotation from Napoleon (10): "On the field of battle . . . the happiest inspiration is often only a recollection".

Of course in so vast a field of fact and judgment any reviewer will find a few matters which, he could wish, had been treated differently or somewhat more fully. The most important of these I shall indicate, briefly, partly for the sake of those who will use this first edition, but especially in the hope that they may be considered in a revision of the present work, which, I sincerely hope, will prove so popular as to need a second edition in the near future.

In Chapter II more use might have been made of Onasander's work *The General*, which is dated (23) somewhat too precisely as composed in 49 A. D. 'Between 49 and 59' would have been better. Among instances of generals killed in battle, Cleon might well have been omitted (he was, in any event, a poor specimen of a 'general'). Far more important figures—such as Lamachus, Lysander, Leosthenes, Tolmides, Hippocrates, Critolaus, Antigonus (killed respectively at Syracuse, Haliartus, Lamia, Coronea, Delium, Thermopylae [Scarpheia], and Ipsus)—might well have been included.

The statement, found on page 17, "If chivalry in war ever existed, it was among the Greeks, and in the days of the Trojan War . . .", needs the qualification that this was true largely only of the formal duel, for the use of poisoned arrows, treacherous murder (like that of Troilus, or the unhappy maceman, Areithoüs, or Rhesus, or Dolon), and the brutalities of Achilles to Hector and the captive Trojans, are as 'unchivalrous' as you please. Besides, Alexander at Arbela was far more likely moved by a desire to avoid the well-known dangers to the attacker of a night assault (think of the Athenians at Syracuse) than by any chivalry.

In connection with page 24 I should say that the duty of a commanding officer to protect his own life was clearly recognized by the Greeks, and by Hannibal (especially by the latter) before the Romans in general acted upon it. On page 26 Aelian is quoted as authority for a theoretical number of an ideal phalanx, instead of the undoubtedly far earlier source, Asclepiodotus (2.7). I am frankly sceptical of the idea advanced on pages 27-28 (compare 151-152) that the Roman legion was in any real sense a "descendant of the Doric phalanx". Of course, in the wished-for second edition of the book Eduard Meyer's admirable

study, *Das Römische Manipularheer, Seine Entwicklung und Seine Vorstufen* (*Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie, Jahrgang 1923*, No. 3) can be utilized for the early history of the legion. Camillus (28) surely does not belong in any authentic history of anything (compare Meyer, 37, note 4). Here also, and especially at the beginning of this chapter (25), it would have been well to call attention to the curious words used for the tactical unit, *phalanx*, really a 'beam', 'log', 'block', or 'pole', and the other early designation, *pyrgos*, 'tower', as indications that the tactical arrangement must once have been cone-shaped or beam-shaped, with the mightiest warrior or warriors at the apex, and the rest behind and slightly to one side of him, as in the well-known *cuneus*, and in the 'boar's head', probably the typical primitive fighting formation of the Indo-European peoples, last seen in action at Sempach (1386 A. D.) with the immortal Arnold von Winkelried (see the excellent discussion by R. Petersdorff, *Germanen und Griechen*, 26-31, 114-117 [Wiesbaden, Jacoby, 1902]). At the beginning of Chapter IV it would be well to point out how the different types of army organization, from chariot fighting, through cavalry, to infantry phalanx corresponded to general political and economic development.

I add now, in sequence, comments that occurred to me as I worked through the book. The references at the beginning of the several items are to the pages,

39.—The statement about the Scythians, the Thracians, and Philip has to do essentially with cavalry, not with infantry formations; indeed, in so far as it concerns Philip, if it is taken of infantry, it is patently absurd.

64-65.—The ghosts of the old round numbers, 100,000 and 900,000, for the forces of Cyrus and Artaxerxes at Cunaxa seem still to be spooking about, despite the schematic character of the calculations and the social-economic impossibility.

68.—To say that "the Spartans numbered some eleven thousand" might easily give a false impression, since it is well known that the real 'Spartans' at Leuctra were only some 700 in number (*Xenophon, Hellenica* 6.4.15).

74.—It is hardly worth taking space to print the round number estimates of the army of Porus.

81.—The introductory sentences about Greek cavalry, following Helbig's much too sweeping generalizations, need some modification in view of E. Meyer's well authenticated reconstruction of the importance of cavalry in Greece in the Greek Middle Ages; see his *Geschichte des Altertums* 2, § 231 (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1893), and the Index, under Ritter, and *Das Römische Manipularheer*, especially 43-46.

85.—The battle of Delium, 424 B. C., and not that of Chaeronea, was, I believe, the earliest instance of cavalry engaging in a vigorous pursuit of a defeated enemy (*Thucydides* 4.96.8), although, since the engagement began very late in the day, the damage inflicted was not as great as would otherwise have been the case.

102.—It might have been well to record that the

first cavalry officer to fortify his camp every night was Iphicrates. More, I think, should have been made of this great military genius, whose contributions to the art (briefly enumerated by Kahrstedt in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie, s. v. Iphikrates, 1 [9.2019-2021] are apt to be overlooked because he had no literary publicity man, as well as of Thucydides, whose penetrating observations outrank in quality, if not in number, I believe, those of any other ancient authority.

108.—The bald statement that "Caesar refrained from attacking the camp of Scipio in the African campaign" is likely to be misleading in view of the facts (1) that under normal conditions no one ever deliberately attacked a Roman camp, and (2) that in the final battle Caesar captured all the camps of the enemy (Bellum Africum 86). Indeed, if I remember rightly, he never fought a regular engagement without sweeping his foes out of their camp, or ever fought twice against the same army, or two pitched battles in the same campaign.

111-112.—It would be better to omit all reference to the tactics of the Allia, since neither the author nor any one else whose opinion is worth considering believes in the authenticity of the ancient accounts.

114.—Hannibal's dependence on the Greeks for much of his military knowledge deserves more elaboration, since it is one of the most effective proofs of the general thesis of Dr. McCartney's book, namely, that there has been an unbroken military tradition from the early days of Greece; and I should regard it as quite certain (115) that Hannibal, a highly educated and studious man, in planning for his crossing of the Rhone, was consciously following the strategem of Alexander in the most famous instance in history on the part of the most famous general in history of crossing a large river in the face of the enemy.

121-122.—The military record of Fabius Cunctator is quite too generously handled. The ancient account of him is pretty clearly the most colossal political fraud ever perpetrated by historians of a particular social class—but that is a subject upon which I am minded to set forth my views at length elsewhere.

128.—I very much doubt if "Carthaginian victory <under Hannibal> would have been a calamity for the Aryan race . . ." ; in fact, I believe it would have been a blessing for the human race, and especially for the Indo-Europeans themselves, not, however, perhaps, precisely as the author had in mind. But I must not obtrude my private heresies into an objective review.

131.—The statements about Caesar surely need some modification. Caesar had had much more military experience before his Gallic wars than is commonly thought—at Mitylene, where he won the civic crown, in Cilicia, in Asia Minor, in the defense against Mithridates, in the naval engagement with the pirates, and in the campaign in Further Spain. Besides, as a fighter, in view of his record briefly sketched just above, there was surely no lack in him of "fire and impetuosity"—under control, of course. As for rashness, the campaigns at Dyrrachium and Alexandria, to say nothing of individual exploits, are surely instances of

"rashness". Perhaps the finest tribute ever paid to Caesar was by an officer of the Confederacy as head-dressed Stonewall Jackson's dead body: "If you meet with Caesar to-night, tell him we still make war".

133.—The old story about the Roman knights at Pharsalus turning to flee because Caesar ordered his cohorts to thrust at their faces had better be omitted, partly because only a very small fraction of Pompey's enormous cavalry force on this occasion was made up of Roman noblemen (Caesar, De Bello Civilis 3.4: he nowhere mentions any Romans proper), and partly because the technical reason for the use of the *pilum* as a handspear at this particular crisis was misunderstood by Plutarch and Appian.

156.—For 'listening devices' Herodotus 4.200 rather than Aeneas Tacticus 37 should be cited as authority.

184.—The brief reference to the Byzantine Period makes one wish that more might have been done with the Period in the way of emphasizing the direct influence of classical antiquity upon the medieval and the modern world, in part through Byzantium. For example, a feature apparently so characteristic of the Middle Ages as the knight armed *cap-a-pie* is merely borrowed from the cataphract cavalry of the late Empire and of Byzantium.

194-195.—There are much better and more accessible editions of Philo and Athenaeus than those of Thevenot, namely editions of Philo by H. Köchly (Leipzig, Engelmann, 1853), and R. Schöne (Berlin, Reimer, 1891), and editions of Athenaeus by C. Weschser (Paris, Imprimerie Imperiale, 1867) and R. Schneider (Berlin, Weidmann, 1912). It may be remarked, in passing, that C. Cichorius, in his Römische Studien, 271-279 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1922), has shown that Athenaeus belongs in the age of Augustus.

204-206.—In the excellent Bibliography one misses especially references to the many notable articles in Daremburg and Saglio, Dictionnaire des Antiquités, and in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie, to C. Weschser, Poliorcétique des Grecs (Paris, Imprimerie Imperiale, 1867), and to Köchly-Rustow's famous work, Geschichte des Griechischen Kriegswesens (Aarau, Verlags-Comptoir, 1882). It is a really reprehensible modesty which leads Dr. McCartney to omit his own important study, The Military Indebtedness of Early Rome to Etruria, Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, 1 (1917), 121-167 (for a notice of this monograph see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.102. See also Dr. McCartney's paper, The Genesis of Rome's Military Equipment, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.74-79).

All these, however, are very slight matters. Dr. McCartney has produced an admirable work for which I hope not merely one but many new editions.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

W. A. OLDFATHER

Aeschylean Tragedy. By Herbert Weir Smyth. Berkeley: University of California Press (1924). Pp. vii + 234.

Professor Herbert Weir Smyth's book, Aeschylean Tragedy, consists of the University of California

Sather lectures, 1923. A Prefatory Note states that they were prepared during the author's residence in Europe in 1922 and at places without libraries containing books on Greek literature, and that they "are designed to serve as an introduction to a further study of the Mind and Art of Aeschylus, to be published by Harvard University at some future date".

The seven chapters following the Introduction (1-32) are devoted each to one of the seven extant plays of the dramatist.

In the Introduction Professor Smyth declares (2) his intention to limit his theme to "the absolute art of Aeschylus", and to pay little attention to the poet's predecessors and successors; nor will he allow himself to enter into the discussion of the origin and early history of tragedy. In this matter he holds fast to the authority of Aristotle and refuses to follow the anthropologist. This first lecture deals mainly with the subject-matter of Aeschylus's plays as a whole, the wide range of the legends he adapted to dramatic representation, and his great fondness for introducing deities and daemonic beings as personages in his dramas. After quoting (32) the opinion of Lord Macaulay that, with the exception of Homer alone, Aeschylus was immeasurably superior to every other poet of antiquity, Professor Smyth concludes with this tribute to the founder of the tragic drama (32):

Not that I have fathomed the depth of the riches of his mind and art. But I count myself happy to have lived long enough to have tried to discover their meaning for human life. For it is worth while to live if only one may catch some reflection of the splendor and the nobility and the majesty of the thought, clothed in the imperial vesture of a sovereign style, voiced in the solemn cadences of harmonious rhythm, that mark the work of Euphorion's son, first of the three greatest religious poets of the world.

The importance of the Suppliant Maidens (33-63) lies in its age and primitive character. It is "the oldest extant tragic drama of the world" (33), it has a chorus of fifty as the dithyramb had, the action is slight, and about three-fifths of the play is choral. The chorus, moreover, is the true protagonist, having a prominent part in the action from beginning to end. This prominence of the chorus is not due, says Professor Smyth, to an abnormal situation or to the plot; it is the survival of primitive tragedy, in which the group uniformly played the chief part. The play has high value, therefore, for the study of the development of the drama.

The Persians (64-91) contains the greatest description of the battle of Salamis that we have, the most authentic account of a battle scene ever written by a poet. Exhibited only seven years after the battle and composed by a combatant for an audience of combatants, it is "the one great tragedy of the world on a recent historical occurrence" (72). To set the scene in the land of the conquered was a clever device, because the only way in which the Greeks could declare their glory in accordance with their religious convictions was to show the wretched plight of their enemies; if

they had glorified themselves, they would have called down nemesis on their own heads.

The grandeur of the Prometheus Bound (92-122) is due, says our author, not solely to its sublime simplicity, nor yet to its magniloquence, but to the altitude and the profundity of its vision, wherein it surpasses all other tragedies of the ancient world. The Zeus who dethroned his father, brought disaster upon Io, and requited with ingratitude and injustice the Titan Prometheus to whom he owed his throne is not the supreme god of Hellas in his loftiest aspect; the Zeus of this early, rudimentary, and savage age is only a god, never God. He belongs to a definite time, he is not the Eternal. Ages pass, long centuries of growth and development intervene; then comes the period of the Prometheus Unbound, which presupposes an infinite extension of moral vision. In the meantime Zeus has been transformed into the moral ruler of the world. "Aeschylus is in fact an evolutionist as regards both gods and man".

That the iniquity of the fathers is visited upon the children unto the third generation is illustrated in the Aeschylean trilogy, Laius, Oedipus, and Seven against Thebes, wherein the curse of Pelops, pronounced upon Laius for his abduction of Pelops's son Chrysippus, is shown to have descended upon the son and the grandsons of the guilty perpetrator of an unnatural crime. The transgression of the various members of the family supplements the curse, and together with it brings ruin upon the race. Since it was Aeschylus's purpose to show the operation of the curse through three generations (Septem 744), he used a trilogy as being best suited to this purpose. His successors, on the other hand, wrote independent plays, in which they treated merely some single great event in the life of one person, such as Oedipus's search for the truth about his birth, described in the Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles. This occupied but one day, whereas Aeschylus with his wider vision did not limit himself in time, nor did he confine himself to a single dramatic crisis. Similarly, when Aeschylus treated the legend of Agamemnon's house, it was only within the ample bounds of a trilogy that he could find space "to trace the march of eternal justice through long reaches of time" (160). It was not man, but God's relation to man, that chiefly concerned him (160).

Although Professor Smyth shares in the common belief that Aristotle did not set up a law of 'unity of time' for Greek tragedy, as the early Italian commentators on the Poetics would have us think, he nevertheless holds that in the Agamemnon the conqueror of Troy is represented as returning to his home in Greece on the morning that followed immediately upon the receipt of the fire-signals announcing the city's downfall (156). This "depredation on the unity of time" (156) is artfully concealed, he explains, by long descriptive passages and extended choral odes which for the audience have the effect of moving the capture of the city into the past. It is simpler, however, to assume an interval of several days between the announcement of Troy's surrender and the king's arrival in Argos,

even though there was no device like the modern curtain to indicate a lapse of time.

In criticism of the chapter on the Libation-Bearers it may be said that too little reference is made to the parallel plays of Sophocles and Euripides. As a title for this drama of Aeschylus the author seems to prefer the name Orestes, and he likewise prefers Clytaemestra as the title of the first member of the trilogy. In explaining the order in which the two guilty personages were killed, Professor Smyth says that Aeschylus made Aegisthus suffer first as being physically the more dangerous and as being the more ignoble criminal. But one may conjecture that the poet had Clytaemestra in mind rather than Aegisthus, and had her killed last in order to magnify the horror of mother-murder and to prolong our memory of it, just as Sophocles, reversing the sequence, put her death first in order to lessen the effect of it through the subsequent murder of Aegisthus. Besides, the Aeschylean order allows the mad scene to come immediately after the act of matricide, as it properly should.

This volume of lectures is very well written. The well-turned phrases, apt metaphors, illuminating comparisons, and, at times, Biblical phraseology give charm to the style and make delightful reading. Again and again one faces the temptation to quote from it some finely-phrased sentence. It is, moreover, the product of ripe scholarship, wide reading, and much thought and reflection, and the views expressed are sane.

DUKE UNIVERSITY,
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

CHARLES W. PEPPLE

A Fortnight in Naples. By André Maurel. Translated by Helen Gerard. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons (1921). Pp. 223. 16 Plans, 120 Illustrations.

In 1921, M. André Maurel, author of Little Cities in Italy (two series) and A Month in Rome, in A Fortnight in Naples offered to tourists guidance during fifteen days of sight-seeing in and around Naples.

The first chapter is concerned with the scenery, the present life of the people, and the city's early history. The second deals with survivals from the days of the Angevin dynasty, under the caption The Failure of the Gothic. The third brings us to what M. Maurel would call The Failure of the Renaissance, so far as Naples of the Aragonese is concerned. During the fourth day we study Naples under the Viceroys. Art and history are discussed in a thoroughly journalistic style. The fifth day brings us to the Bourbons, the sixth to visit the Museum. Its picture gallery finds more favor with M. Maurel than with the present reviewer.

Palaeopolis is the title of the seventh chapter, which deals with the destruction of Pompeii and tries to bring back its life by an account of that which is still lived in the old quarters of Naples. One detects a certain dilettantism in the author's interpretation of Pompeii. For instance, it is a shame to convert the House of the

Vettii into the dwelling of a courtesan (211) on the strength of the licentious picture that for us disgraces, but in Pompeian opinion protected the entrance. Nor will any well-informed person conclude from the frescoes of Pompeii that the inhabitants of that city were a people of dissolute habits (212). The reference to a house of Livy at Rome (214) is probably a slip of the translator. The statement that, in the House of the Vettii, "the cubicula have been made into cellars", still puzzles me, even if I guess that there is some confusion involved between a cellar and a *cella*.

On the eighth day, we go to Herculaneum In Memory of Pliny. M. Maurel's picture of scenes between Naples and Torre del Greco is shockingly true, I can attest, having footed many a mile of it, learning by my eyes better than from any books what a tradition of degradation can be charged against Bourbon misrule and its aftermath.

The classical scholar will be interested in M. Maurel's acceptance of the theory of Giuseppe de Lorenzo that it was *some time after* Pompeii was destroyed that Herculaneum was "buried by torrents of mud poured down by the subsequent rains" (234), and that the bronzes of Herculaneum owe their present surface to "restorers of the eighteenth century who scraped, rubbed down, and varnished them", but "when they were taken out <they> were covered by a malachite green crust" of carbonate of copper.

The heading for the ninth day is The Two Ubus, Kings of Naples. In the next, The Lovers' Coast, Salerno and Amalfi, we have abundant description of one of the wonder-regions of the world. The eleventh day speeds us to The Happy Isle, Capri. The account is preceded by a eulogy of Sorrento. This chapter is the best in the book, although I suspect that, like most tourists, M. Maurel has scant knowledge of the region beyond Monte Solaro which means so much to those of us who have lived on the island for any length of time.

The next chapter bears a heading The Heaving Region: Bosom of Baia that is so suggestive of the unseemly as to require from the translator a humorous notice to the British censor that "il seno di Baia" is quite proper in Italian. The reader accompanies the author by way of Posillipo, the Solfatara, and Pozzuoli to Baiae, which last locality is reserved for the thirteenth day. Then, under the title Tea at the Villa of Lucullus, we have a dialogue carried on by M. Maurel with two distinguished Italian friends, in a villa on the slope of Capo di Miseno, and with wine, geology, topography, and history as topics. A discussion of ancient villas and the life led in them, though slight, should be welcome to travelers who rarely have enough knowledge of that subject to appreciate what was once the appearance of the Baian shores. The fourteenth day is to be spent With the Sibyl around Cumae and Lake Avernus, while a climb up Mount Vesuvius furnishes the climax of a very entertaining and, for the most part, trustworthy book.

WALTON BROOKS McDANIEL